IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CRIMINAL APPLICATION No 464 of 2001

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE A.M.KAPADIA

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : YES

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

@

JIGAR BABAABHAI RAWAT

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

1. Special Criminal Application No. 464 of 2001

MR MM TIRMIZI for Petitioner No. 1

MR KT DAVE, APP for Respondent No. 1

RULE SERVED for Respondent No. 2

RULE NOT RECD BACK for Respondent No. 3

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE A.M.KAPADIA

Date of decision: 31/08/2001

ORAL JUDGEMENT

#. In this petition filed under Article-226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has challenged the

order dated July 31, 2000 (Annexure-'B' to the petition) passed by the externing Authority i.e. Deputy Police Commissioner, Zone-III, Ahmedabad City by which he has externed the petitioner for a period of two years from five districts i.e. Ahmedabad Rural, Ahmedabad City, Kheda, Gandhinagar and Mehsana and also the order dated May 22, 2001 (Annexure-'C' to the petition) passed by the appellate Authority confirming the said order and prayed to issue appropriate writ, order or direction quashing and setting aside both the above orders.

#. A show-cause notice dated December 13, 1999 under sec.59 of the Bombay Police Act was issued to the petitioner, wherein, several allegations were made against him to the effect that he is a strong headed quarrelsome and aggressive person who has no fear of law and order, picking up quarrel with people and give threats to kill them, continues his anti social activities by which he is causing physical and financial damage to the people and the people are afraid of filing complaint against him and the activities carried out by him is detrimental for maintenance of public order. Moreover, he is making assault on women to outrage their modesty. Besides this, three criminal cases for the commission of offences under the Indian Penal Code were registered at Naranpura Police Station. Therefore, by issuing a show-cause notice the petitioner was called upon to show cause as to why he should not be externed for a period of two years from the districts to which reference is made in earlier paragraph of this judgment.

#. The petitioner gave reply to the said show-cause notice on January 7, 2000. The externing Authority, after considering the reply and material on record, passed the impugned order of externment dated July 31, 2000 in exercise of the powers conferred under sec.56-B of the Act externing the petitioner for a period of two years from the above mentioned districts.

#. Aggrieved by the aforesaid order passed by the externing Authority, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the appellate Authority, which was dismissed by the appellate Authority vide order dated May 22, 2001 which has given rise to the present petition.

#. Mr.Tirmizi, learned advocate for the petitioner raised several contentions and tried to convince this Court that the order of externment suffers from various vices much less it is recorded in clear non-application of mind. Besides this, he has also raised a contention that the externing Authority has considered the criminal

cases which were registered in the year 1997 and 1998, and therefore, on the basis of stale material of 1997, order passed by the externing Authority can be said to be an order passed without application of mind. Therefore, according to the learned advocate for the petitioner the impugned order of externment suffers from the vices of non-application of mind, and is, therefore, liable to be quashed and set aside.

#. Mr. Dave, learned APP opposed the petition and contended that the petitioner is a strong headed person and his activities are detrimental to the society at large. He is involved in three criminal cases, therefore, the externing Authority has rightly passed the order externing the petitioner for a period of two years. He, therefore, urged to dismiss the petition.

#. I have considered the submissions advanced by the learned advocates for the parties. I have also perused the averments made in the petition and the order passed by the externing Authority, so also the order passed by the appellate Authority and other papers annexed to the petition.

#. It is true that the externing Authority has power under sec.56 of the Act to remove or extern a person not only from the district within which the externing Authority has jurisdiction, but also from the district contiguous to his own district. The criteria for passing such an order is provided for in sec.56 and there must be some indication in the order itself of the existence of circumstances which would lead to the satisfaction of the authority that it was necessary not only to extern a person from his own district but also from the contiguous district. Such circumstances must be qua every area or region from which a person is directed to be externed and there must be some material or indication of such material in the order.

#. Coming to the facts of the present case, there is no matter of doubt that the externing Authority has not mentioned either in his show-cause notice or in the impugned order of externment as to what necessitated him to pass the order of externment of the petitioner from the above mentioned four districts in addition to Ahmedabad District. Therefore, it can be said that at the time of passing of the impugned order of externment the externing Authority has not mentioned as to why the petitioner should be externed from other four districts in addition to Ahmedabad District. On this sole ground,

the order of the externing Authority externing the petitioner and that of the appellate Authority confirming the order of externment are rendered invalid and illegal and deserves to be quashed and set aside.

##. For the foregoing reasons, the petition succeeds and is accordingly allowed. The impugned orders at Annexures-'B' and 'C' to the petition are quashed and set aside. Rule is made absolute. Direct service is permitted.

August 31, 2001. (A.M. Kapadia, J.)

/sakkaf